



LLYFRGELL GENEDLAETHOL CYMRU THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WALES

Mae'r fersiwn digidol hwn o'r erthygl/cylchgrawn wedi'i greu gan Lyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru.

NODER y gall cyfyngiadau hawlfraint ac amodau trwydded fod yn berthnasol. Am ragor o wybodaeth, ewch i **Mwy o Wybodaeth** wrth ddarllen y cylchgrawn ar wefan [Cylchgronau Cymru](http://cylchgronau.llyfrgell.cymru) (cylchgronau.llyfrgell.cymru).

Efallai y bydd hefyd gennych ddiddordeb yn [Papurau Newydd Cymru](http://papuraunewydd.llyfrgell.cymru) (papuraunewydd.llyfrgell.cymru), chwaer-wefan gan Lyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru sy'n rhoi mynediad i dros 1.1 milwn o dudalennau o dros 130 o bapurau newydd a gyhoeddwyd rhwng 1805 a 1919.

This digital version of the article/journal has been created by The National Library of Wales.

PLEASE NOTE that copyright restrictions and license terms may apply. For more information, view **More Information** when reading the journal on the [Welsh Journals](http://journals.library.wales) (journals.library.wales) website.

You may also be interested in [Welsh Newspapers](http://newspapers.library.wales) (newspapers.library.wales), a sister-site from the National Library of Wales that gives access to over 1.1 million pages from over 130 newspapers published between 1805 and 1919.



NOTES ON THE WELSH GENEALOGICAL MANUSCRIPTS

by PETER C. BARTRUM

INTRODUCTORY

I WAS first drawn to examine Welsh genealogical manuscripts after discovering from the *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language* that there was unedited material in them concerning the persons of early Welsh history and legend, my chief interest at the time being in the Arthurian Legend. This led to a study of the genealogical material contained in Cardiff MS. 25 and related manuscripts and resulted in four articles in which most of this material was edited for the first time.¹

I already knew from Lewys Dwnn's *Heraldic Visitations of Wales*² and other published genealogical works that many of the Welsh *uchelwyr*, 'gentry', were given descents from early Welsh heroes, historical or legendary. This intrigued me because the pedigrees supporting such claims might well enshrine old traditions of interest. However, the pedigrees linking the *uchelwyr* to heroic ancestors as given by Dwnn and others were often so corrupt that they carried little weight. I soon discovered that the earlier Welsh genealogical manuscripts gave much better texts, but it was no simple matter to find the 'linking' pedigrees. Generally speaking the pedigrees of the *uchelwyr* in the genealogical manuscripts are content to carry the line back to some well known historical ancestor, whom I call a 'patriarch' for convenience. Only very occasionally is a pedigree carried beyond a 'patriarch', and this may be a patriarch in a female line. It was clear that, to get the best texts, a careful study of all the early Welsh genealogical manuscripts was necessary. For this purpose I went through all those known to me of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as a few later ones. The results of these investigations resulted in two articles.³

¹ Now incorporated in EWGT under ByS, ByA, ABT, HIL. The original articles have fuller notes.

² Edited by S. R. Meyrick, 2 vols., Llandovery, 1846.

³ PP₁ and PP₂.

After that I was drawn, somewhat against my will, to investigate the pedigrees of the *uchelwyr* themselves in order to obtain reliable estimates of the dates of the various patriarchs. This grew into a full-scale study of the pedigrees of the *uchelwyr* all over Wales and the Marches, using the most reliable material available, mainly in manuscripts. In order to keep the study within practical limits I concentrated on the period ending about 1350-1400, and am now approaching the stage of having genealogical tables, as complete as possible up to this date, based on all the reliable material available to me from the genealogical manuscripts and other sources.

In the process of these investigations a certain amount of information has come my way, which has only been possible through careful examination and comparison of the manuscripts, and much travelling between the libraries at Aberystwyth, Cardiff, the British Museum, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford. As investigators in this field are few it was felt that some of the gleanings might be of interest and even of value to others who may wish to make use of Welsh genealogies. I am grateful to Professor Idris Foster for his encouragement in the writing of this article, to the Librarians and their assistants, and especially to Mr. R. W. McDonald, Research Assistant at the National Library of Wales, for the trouble they have taken to help me in my researches.

In the following pages I discuss mainly the pedigrees of the *uchelwyr*. Older tracts such as *Bonedd y Saint* and Royal pedigrees continued to be copied into the same manuscripts. In most cases the copies were made from recent versions rather than from earlier sources. For example the 'Hanesyn Hen' material which is found in manuscripts of the sixteenth century onwards was mostly based (not necessarily at first-hand) on an 'edited' version by Gutun Owain, contained in a manuscript of 1497, now lost.⁴ Jesus College MS. 20 was apparently unknown to the genealogists of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries. As a result, for example, the real wife of Cadwgon ab Elystan Glodrydd, Angharad ferch Llawr (JC 31), is not found in any of these manuscripts, and only re-appears in copies of the Jesus College manuscript which were made in the eighteenth century,⁵ and in manuscripts, such as Cardiff 4. 33 (c. 1750), whose authors probably had access to these copies. It is noteworthy, however, that Mostyn MS. 134

⁴ See EWGT p. 79 and note, and below p. xx. In 1718 this manuscript belonged to Moses Williams, according to Humfrey Wanley in the *Catalogue* of Harleian MSS. under Harl. 1970.

⁵ See EWGT p. 41.

(early seventeenth century) fo. 17, contains a passage about Ceneu Menrudd which agrees word for word with JC 33-34.

In his article 'An approach to Welsh Genealogy', *Trans. Cym.*, 1948, pp. 303-466, Major Francis Jones has given a very full survey of the subject of Welsh genealogy in general. The present article does not attempt to cover such a wide field. It is more in the nature of a supplement in depth of certain aspects of the subject, with some minor corrections, to Francis Jones's article. I shall confine myself here to the manuscripts of the period 1475-1560 and to the later comprehensive compilations.

Most of the later manuscripts repeat over and over again material already found in earlier manuscripts. This is natural because the manuscripts were written by and for people who did not have ready access to other manuscripts, and wanted to have a store of information for themselves. However, there are few manuscripts which do not contribute something new and of interest to the corpus of genealogical data; perhaps an extra generation or two in the pedigree of a local family, an anecdote, or a quotation, which has not survived elsewhere, from some lost manuscript of importance. What is needed is for someone to go through these manuscripts and pick out the new from the commonplace. This would be an arduous undertaking, and would not be possible until the fundamental material had been published.

FORM OF THE EARLY PEDIGREES

The great majority of the early pedigrees are in narrative form and, of these, most consist of a pedigree in the male line going back to some well-known ancestor, followed by pedigrees of the mothers of each of the immediate male ancestors. The mother's mother is often given and the mothers of other members of mothers' pedigrees may also be given. The extent to which information on mothers is given is very variable, ranging from nil to pedigrees of great length covering several pages. The general result is a pedigree branching backwards in time, unlike the more familiar tabular pedigree which branches forwards in time, giving cousins of various degrees. Examples of the more elaborate kind are the pedigree of Robert ap Gruffudd ap Rhys of Maesmor, Llangwm Dinmael by Gutun Owain, copied by Robert Vaughan in Pen. 131 pp. 177-188, (see below p. xx); that of Henry VIII in Pen. 127 pp. 65-76 (the beginning is lost but can be supplied from a copy in Gwysaney MS. 23 fos. 8f.); the pedigree of Edward ap Roger in Pen. 128 pp. 296-567, (see below p. 82). A short example by Gutun Owain is given in Appendix 1.

Interspersed with these we occasionally find, in narrative form, an account of the descendants of an individual, which would today be given in tabular form. Such pedigrees do not necessarily confine themselves to descendants in the male line, but often include descendants of daughters, and daughters of daughters. Major examples are: the descendants of Llywelyn ap Gwrgan in Cydweli, by Ieuan Brechfa, in Pen. 131 pp. 250-256; and the descendants of Gwladus ferch Dafydd Gam in Pen. 127 pp. 169-172. A short example by Gutun Owain is given in Appendix 2.

The fact that mothers were normally given rather than wives avoided the question of legitimacy. Only rarely do we find mention of *cariadwraig* or *cariadferch*.

Tabular pedigrees begin to appear in the manuscripts of Gruffudd Hiraethog. These are generally very untidy and carelessly drawn up. They are frequently supplemented by narrative passages and sometimes they are merely duplications (with minor differences) of narrative pedigrees which appear elsewhere.

When lists of children are given in the pedigrees, the order cannot be relied on. It often varies in different places and it is clear that little importance was attached to the order. Gruffudd Hiraethog, for example, gives a list of ten sons and then says that the last mentioned was the eldest (Pen. 133 p. 37). It is quite clear from the manner in which Gruffudd Hiraethog drew up his tabular pedigrees that he was not interested in the order of the children even if he knew it. The fact that in most of the early genealogies the order is unreliable means that the later compilers of comprehensive tabular pedigrees could not normally be certain of the order of the children. When a tabular pedigree was constructed by combining a number of *ascending* pedigrees there was nothing at all to indicate the seniority of the various brothers and sisters.

It is therefore quite unrealistic to attach any significance to the order in which the children are given in the comprehensive works of Robert Vaughan, David Edwardes, etc. Discretion is necessary, at any rate, and there are cases when one can accept the order, for example when Robert Vaughan gives a list of his own children in Pen. 287.

The early pedigrees often did not give names to mothers or wives. For example we find in Pen. 131 p. 93: 'Mam Wilim ap Gruffudd oedd [space] verch Gruffudd ap Tudur ap Madoc ap Iarddur.' It appears that names were sometimes invented to fill these gaps by later copyists, and the result is that we often find discrepancies in the names of the women among different versions of the same pedigree.

It was not uncommon for the same name to be given to brothers or half-brothers, and similarly with daughters. For example we

know that 'The lord Rhys' had three sons named Maredudd,⁶ and Gruffudd ap Cynan had two daughters named Gwenllïan.⁷ Generally they were distinguished by epithets, *Fwya* and *Fychan*, *Ddu* and *Llwyd*, or the like. In the case of daughters we may find that a daughter named Angharad, say, is recorded as having married two different persons. We cannot assume that it was the same daughter with two different husbands unless this is definitely stated by some good authority. This is particularly so in view of the uncertainty in the names of daughters, mentioned above. In fact, when we know that a woman was married twice we sometimes find that she is given different names when the separate marriages are recorded.

The fact that pedigrees are mostly given in the ascending form leads to the result that minor lines which died out may not be recorded. On the other hand the prominence given to ancestry in the female lines often led to a branch of a family being recorded that would otherwise have been forgotten. Such lines, presumably ending with an heiress, occur frequently in the pedigrees, and are sometimes quite long, but we are often left in the dark as to the estate which such an heiress inherited.

GENEALOGY AND POETRY

The Welsh poets in singing the praises of their patrons often introduced genealogical information. This can sometimes be used to check the pedigrees obtained from more prosaic sources. The information given in poetry is seldom sufficiently precise for us to construct a pedigree from the poem itself. Nevertheless poetry often contains our earliest evidence for material contained in pedigrees and sometimes may help to choose between rival versions. For example, Guto'r Glyn (1440-93) and Lewis Glyn Cothi (fl. 1447-86) both mention a certain Godwin as ancestor of the Herberts. This confirms the earlier pedigrees which are found in mid-sixteenth century manuscripts as against the later forgery mentioned below, (p. 70). Iolo Goch (c. 1320-c. 1398) in his poem 'Achau Owain Glyndŵr'⁸ gave a long list of Owain Glyndŵr's ancestors, historical and legendary, but a pedigree cannot be constructed from it. Occasionally we find a poem which gives a complete pedigree. An example is that of Dafydd Goch of

⁶ See PAR 1c, 3g, h.

⁷ J. E. Lloyd, *History of Wales*, p. 417, n. 57.

⁸ *Cywyddau Iolo Goch ac Eraill*, ed. Henry Lewis, Thomas Roberts and Ifor Williams, new edition, Cardiff, 1937, No. XI.

Stapleton Castle, near Presteign, given by Lewis Glyn Cothi.⁹ The pedigree goes back to Llywarch ap Brân of Môn. Whether the upper reaches of the pedigree are correct is another matter, but it indicates that there was an early tradition that Einion ap Llywarch ap Brân had descendants in Elfael.

When a poem is approximately contemporary with a genealogy we may expect substantial agreement between the two, because the information for both probably came from the same source, the family itself. Up to the end of the sixteenth century poetry and genealogy often went together. Gutun Owain, Ieuan Brechfa, Lewys Morgannwg, Gruffudd Hiraethog, Wiliam Llŷn, Simwnt Fychan and Lewys Dwnn are outstanding examples of poets who interested themselves in genealogy.

RELIABILITY

One is immediately struck by the steady deterioration in the accuracy of the early parts of genealogies after the time of Gruffudd Hiraethog, that is after about 1560. Errors tended to multiply because copyists normally used the latest texts available. They were generally uncritical and seldom interested in going back to earlier texts. Thus an error once introduced tended to be promulgated indefinitely and often became more or less standard. It is easy to understand, if not to condone, these facts. The difficulties of travel must be taken into account. Most of the manuscripts were in private hands, and private individuals were quite understandably not over-anxious to lend manuscripts which they possessed. The line of least resistance was to copy the nearest manuscript available, and it was easier to read and copy a recent manuscript than one a hundred years old, or more.

Much has been said about the unreliability of Welsh genealogies, and it is certain that if approached uncritically they may lead one seriously astray. Any one pedigree must be carefully checked. This applies equally to English pedigrees of the same date, if not more so. In some ways the absence of Welsh surnames during the period was an aid to accuracy, as a person could only be properly identified by giving several generations of his ancestors. This does not mean that he was generally known by such a string of names.¹⁰ But it was no use to say that a man's wife was the daughter of Gruffudd ap Ieuan (say) or, as in later times, Richard ap John. Even the addition of a place name is not always sufficient.

⁹ *Gwaith*, edited by E. D. Jones, 1953, No. 59.

¹⁰ Cf. AWG p. 362.

The absence of dates or any anecdote that could fix an approximate date for persons in a pedigree made it difficult for the early manuscript writers to check chronological consistency even if they thought of such a thing. But quite a number of glaring errors probably passed unnoticed through this cause. In order to arrive at a reasonably safe pedigree when direct evidence is not available it is necessary to compare different versions, and check collateral lines. The pedigrees of mothers must also be checked in the same way. By using all this evidence and building upwards, downwards and sideways to known dates one can test the consistency of the various versions, pick out the most probable one, and very often explain the inconsistencies or errors. The more important families have left records which can give valuable clues as to date, and verify links in a pedigree. But it is seldom that one can build a pedigree from such sources alone. There are various surveys¹¹ available for the period, which can be useful for dating, but identification of persons cannot always be certain unless the survey gives at least two generations of ancestors, and even then there is danger of mis-identification. If an unusual epithet is given to a person this can be of great help in identification.

One gets the general impression that the early genealogies are remarkably reliable when allowance is made for accidental mistakes, mainly due to carelessness or ignorance. Nevertheless it must be emphasized that no single pedigree can be safely accepted without critical examination. Testimony to the *general* accuracy of Welsh pedigrees is quoted by Major Francis Jones.¹²

If a pedigree extends sufficiently far backwards, it may stray into the region of legend, that is unless the family concerned has a genuine royal descent, in which case the pedigree may well be substantially correct right back to the dark ages. Since the royal line had already, by the middle of the thirteenth century, been extended back to Adam in the genealogy of Gruffudd ap Cynan¹³ it was quite natural to repeat this, as was occasionally done. It is, of course, these long pedigrees that have caused most criticism, but if one realizes how such pedigrees were constructed, and appreciates the beliefs of the time, it is easy enough to understand

¹¹ For example: *The Record of Caernarvon*, edited by Henry Ellis, Public Record Commission, London, 1838. [1352, 1419]. *The Survey of the Honour of Denbigh, 1334*, edited by Paul Vinogradoff and Frank Morgan, London, 1914. *The First Extent of Bromfield and Yale, A.D. 1315*, by T. P. Ellis, Cymmrodorion Record Series, No. 11, London, 1924. *The Black Book of St. David's*, edited by J. W. Willis-Bund, Cymmrodorion Record Series, No. 5, London, 1902. [1326]. *The Lordship of Oswestry, 1393-1607*, by W. J. Slack, Shrewsbury, 1951.

¹² AWG p. 306.

¹³ See EWGT p. 36, and the extended version p. 121.

their existence and to decide roughly at what point any pedigree becomes legendary or fictitious.

I do not believe that any of the better known genealogists were guilty of deliberate falsifying, but suggest that faked pedigrees, when they occurred, were concocted by members or retainers of certain families which wanted to 'improve' their pedigrees. These were passed off to enquirers and occasionally got into the more respectable collections. For example, the pretended descent of Ffalcws (Palgus) of Harlech from Ednyfed Fychan, which got into Pen. 128 p. 659, Dwnn ii. 221, and the pedigree of Hobi of Radnor which pretended to go back to Ithel Hael ap Hywel ab Emyr Llydaw, the father of sixth century saints. Although Gruffudd Hiraethog entered the latter in his notebook (Pen. 132 p. 276), I doubt if he believed it. The best known of the faked pedigrees is that of the Herberts which began to appear in Welsh manuscripts at the close of the sixteenth century.¹⁴ This had been backed up by a forged document dated 1460, and most of the contemporary genealogists were duped.

The most remarkable exercise of genealogical invention known to me is the pedigree of the Wolfs of Wolvesnewton, found in Dwnn i. 11. Apparently not content with an earlier fabrication which traced the family back to Leofric, Earl of Coventry (d. 1057)¹⁵ someone thought out a more ambitious pedigree going back to Roman times (A.D. 79). The tabular pedigree is complete with branches and marriages going right through the dark ages, yet there is not one historical or legendary person mentioned in the whole concoction! Lewys Dwnn patiently copied the whole rigmarole, but he could not possibly have composed it, and surely he must have realized that it was a fake.¹⁶

That Gruffudd Hiraethog could be sceptical is shown, for example, by a remark in Pen. 176 p. 43: 'ac i Llywelyn ap Iorwerth medd vo'.

There were four main types of error:

1. *Omission of names.* This is sometimes due to 'skipping', especially where two similar or identical names occur near to one another (*homoeoteleuton*), but more often carelessness. Such errors can generally be rectified by comparison of different versions. Minor families who claimed descent from a well-known patriarch often have pedigrees which are grossly short of

¹⁴ See PP₁ § 69 and PP₂ pp. 160-1.

¹⁵ See *Llyfr Baglan*, ed. J. A. Bradney, London, 1910, p. 69.

¹⁶ The pedigree is in Egerton MS. 2585 fos. 20^r-25^v and is definitely in Lewys Dwnn's hand.

generations. One suspects that in some cases the pedigree is fictitious. However, the claim may be valid though the pedigree is deficient. In any case one can probably rely on the immediate ancestors as being correct. Very often one can determine where the gap occurs by considering the marriages recorded.

2. *Insertion of collateral lines.* This is infrequent in the early genealogies, and the explanation, when it occurs in later texts, may be that the material has been drawn from a tabular pedigree which has been misinterpreted. On the other hand when a minor family has a pedigree which is much too long, going back to a familiar 'patriarch', the suspicion is that the descent from this patriarch is fictitious.

3. *Wives and mothers confused*, wives of two generations exchanged, grandmothers turned into mothers, and the like. Examples of this occur in the oldest texts.¹⁷

4. *Misidentification.* It is tempting to try and remove chronological difficulties by supposing that two or more persons of the same name (and perhaps patronymic or epithet) have been confused. This is an easy way out of difficulty which must be resisted unless there is good supporting evidence. But errors of this kind certainly occurred.¹⁸

It is hoped to give a number of examples of all these types of error in a subsequent article.

GUTUN OWAIN

On Gutun Owain (fl. c. 1460 - c. 1498), see DWB, BBCS xv. 99-109 (1953) by Thomas Roberts, AWG pp. 352-5. His real name was Gruffydd ap Huw ab Owain and his pedigree is given in Pen. 128 p. 86. The pedigree of his uncle, Dafydd ab Owain, is given in Pen. 129 p. 86. He was descended from Iorwerth ap Cynddelw the brother of Iarddur ap Cynddelw of Arllechwedd Uchaf. It appears that it was Hwfa Llwyd, the great-great-grandfather of Gutun Owain who was the first of the family to acquire land at Ifton of the Traean in the parish of St. Martins, Lordship of Oswestry. (Pen. 132 p. 92). See also PF. iii. 385-6. Harl. 1969 p. 213 records some descendants.

Gutun Owain is the earliest of the genealogists whose name we know and whose manuscripts have survived. He made a copy of the genealogical parts of *Hanesyn Hen* in Llanstephan MS. 28 (c. 1475). His treatment of the *Hanesyn Hen* and allied material

¹⁷ See e.g. EWGT p. 151.

¹⁸ See e.g. EWGT p. 155 for early examples.

has already been mentioned (p. 64). Peniarth MS. 131 is the only surviving manuscript which contains pedigrees of the *uchelwyr* in Gutun Owain's own hand. Besides the lost manuscript already mentioned (p. 64), Gutun Owain wrote at least part of "Y Llyfr Bychan o Vaesmor" which was copied by Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt and is now in Pen. 131 pp. 177-188. There are other copies in Pen. 177 pp. 57-67, and Mostyn 149 pp. 34-40. Pen. 177 pp. 37-45 were also copied by Gruffudd Hiraethog from a manuscript by Gutun Owain no longer extant. Again, there is a short passage said to be copied *allan o lyfr Guttyn Owain* in Wrexham MS. 1 p. 407. Among the authorities used by Peter Ellis (see below p. 85) was

RM Mr Rich: Mathewes booke of Valle Crucis written by Guttun Owen vt dicitr.

Gutun Owain seems to have been interested in re-arranging and preserving for posterity material that he found in earlier manuscripts. He wrote neatly. The pedigrees of the *uchelwyr* are mostly brought down to the generation before his own, which suggests that he was mainly copying older material. Nevertheless his travels as a poet must have given him ample opportunity for obtaining genealogical information. Unlike Gruffudd Hiraethog he seldom mentions localities, even as headings to his pedigrees, and dates are entirely absent. His genealogical work is almost wholly confined to north Wales, Powys and the March. He is said to have been a member of a Commission sent into Wales to 'search out' the pedigree of Owen Tudor, but I am yet to be convinced that there ever was such a commission.¹⁹

IEUAN BRECHFA

On Ieuan Brechfa (c. 1430-1500), see DWB. What we know of his pedigree is gleaned from Pen. 133 p. 48 and Mostyn 134 fo. 51^v. Pen. 133 p. 48 mentions the marriage of his daughter, Gwenllian, to Hywel ap Rhys of Cefn Cethin in Llandeilio [Fawr]. He was the son of Iorwerth²⁰ ap Dafydd ap Ieuan ap Iorwerth,

¹⁹ The supposed 'Return' of this Commission is given in Card. 50 pp. 133-144 and Mostyn 113 pp. 165-176 (First folio lost). The text was printed very inaccurately in William Wynne's *History of Wales*, 1774 edition, pp. 331-342. This was reprinted with all its errors in Dwnn i. xiv-xx. A slightly fuller version (c. 1550, by Humphrey Llwyd?) appears in BM. Royal MS. 18 A lxxv.

²⁰ Iorwerth omitted by Pen. 133, but supplied by Mostyn 134.

but there seems to be no further information about his male ancestry. His grandmother,²¹ Gwenllian, was descended from Madog Seithydd of Defynnog, of whom a story is told by Ieuan Brechfa himself in Pen. 131 p. 231.

Pen. 131 pp. 199-308 (c. 1500) is the only surviving genealogical manuscript in his hand, and most of the later quotations from his work may be traced to this manuscript. Unfortunately quite a number of pages were lost from this manuscript at an early date as can be shown from internal evidence, (see below p. 77). A work now apparently lost was a black book of parchment which he wrote for Sir Rhys ap Thomas (d. 1525), as we learn from Lewys Dwnn who made a copy. (Dwnn i. 26-27). Mostyn 134 fo. 51^v quotes a passage from his work that does not seem to occur elsewhere.

Ieuan Brechfa's main genealogical work covers Deheubarth, that is, Ceredigion, Dyfed and Ystrad Tywi, and it is particularly valuable because we have very little more material covering this area for about a generation, when we come to the works of Lewys ab Edward and Gruffudd Hiraethog.

Two examples of his genealogical work have been published, namely, 'Plant yr Arglwydd Rhys' and 'Bonedd Henrri Saithved' in the *National Library of Wales Journal* xiv pp. 97 and 330 respectively. In spite of what J. G. Evans said (RWM i. 812) his orthography in Pen. 131 is unmistakably that of south Wales. The so called 'Brut Ieuan Brechfa' in the *Myvyrian Archaiology* is now known to be a forgery by Iolo Morganwg.

LEWYS MORGANNWG AND LEWYS AB EDWARD

On Lewys Morgannwg (fl. 1520-65) see DWB and AWG p. 358. In Pen. 178 part 1, p. 41 we read:

Lewys Morganwc, penkerdd ac athro kelvyddyd kerdd davawd drwy holl Gymrv yr hwnn a elwir *Llywelyn*, ap Rissiart Morganwg, prydydd a phenkerdd, ap Rys brydydd, penkerdd o gelvyddyd kerdd davawd, ap Ieuan ap Howel ap Rys vychan [of Tir Iarll] ap Rys voel ap Rys goch.

From this it appears that he was nephew of Gwilym Tew (fl. 1460-80) ap Rys Brydydd. (Pen. 178 part 1, p. 42). Above Rhys Goch (born c. 1200) the pedigree is defective but it indicates a claim to descent from Einion ap Gollwyn. Pages 107-140 and 143-9 of

²¹ Mother (Pen. 133), grandmother (Mostyn 134).

Pen. 132 are said to be in his hand. This is stated by Robert Vaughan at the head of page 107: 'Llaw Lewys Morganwc sydd yn calyn medd Rys Cain'. Only pages 118-140 and 143-9 are genealogical. They are written carefully and accurately in a neat small hand, and appear to be copies of older material.

I began to have doubts about the ascription of these pages to Lewys Morgannwg for the following reasons. On pp. 93-100 of Pen. 133 Gruffudd Hiraethog made a copy of pp. 132-4 of Pen. 132. On page 100 of Pen. 133 he refers to this as 'Y copi o lyfr Lewys ap Edwart'. Again on p. 145 of Pen. 133 he refers to a passage on page 133 of Pen. 132 as being 'Yn llyfr Lewys ap Edwart'. On the other hand there are many references in Pen. 133 to 'Llyfr yr athro Lewys Morgannwc' or the like, but in none of these cases does the matter appear in the above pages of Pen. 132. I therefore decided to check the handwriting. The only piece of writing certainly in the hand of Lewys Morgannwg is the Licence of Gruffudd Hiraethog as Pencerdd, written and signed by Lewys himself in Pen. 194. This writing is not the same as that in Pen. 132.

It appears therefore that pp. 107-140 and 143-9 of Pen. 132 are not by Lewys Morgannwg but by Lewys ab Edward. 'Llyfr Achau Lewys ap Edwart' is often referred to by Gruffudd Hiraethog, for example in Pen. 133 pp. 100, 145, 159, 166, Pen. 134 p. 183, Pen. 135 pp. 378, 438. From these it is clear that the pages of Pen. 132 are only a small portion of his work.

On Lewys ab Edward (fl. c. 1560) see DWB s.n. Lewis ab Edward, and R. W. McDonald in *Llên Cymru* 6, pp. 97-104. It does not appear that there is any other known example of his hand with which we can compare Pen. 132 pp. 107f. Although Lewys ab Edward was a native of Denbighshire we know that he was interested in the Heraldry of south Wales, for Gruffudd Hiraethog writes in Pen. 133 p. 159: 'Deav. Kopi llyfr Lewys ap Edwart'. Thus the fact that the parts of Pen. 132, formerly ascribed to Lewys Morgannwg, are mainly concerned with Deheubarth is no argument against the proposition that they are really by Lewys ab Edward.

GRUFFUDD HIRAETHOG

On Gruffudd Hiraethog (d. 1564) see DWB and AWG pp. 365-9. His pedigree can be worked out by combining references in Pen. 176 pp. 40, 294 and Pen. 177 p. 286. See also Pen. 128 p. 685, which differs slightly. He appears to have been the son of Mathew ab Owain Cyfeiliog ap John Cyfeiliog; that is, not the great Owain Cyfeiliog (although some genealogists fell into this

trap) but a lesser person of the same name. This lesser Owain Cyfeiliog claimed descent from Seisyll of Meirionydd (Pen. 176 p. 40), but the pedigree is deficient. This Owain Cyfeiliog was also ancestor of the family of Owen of Adbrightlee (now Albrightlee) in Shropshire.²² Owain Cyfeiliog's wife's ancestry is given through one female link to the great Owain Cyfeiliog (d. 1197). Gruffudd Hiraethog's wife was a descendant of Owain Glyndŵr.²³

Although Gruffudd Hiraethog could write neatly, most of his manuscripts appear to be rough notebooks and are often very difficult to read. This is due not only to the untidy writing but also because he made frequent erasures, crossed out, wrote one word over another instead of crossing out, made additions between lines, and because of fading ink. The main manuscripts in which his genealogical writings appear are Pen. 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139 (two parts + index), 176, 177 and 178 part 1. A typical example of a page is shown in Plate 1.

Judging from old folio numbering, etc., it is clear that some of the present manuscripts in his hand are bindings of originally separate groups of pages. For example in Pen. 133, pages 29-36, 37-56, 57-92, 93-100, 101-210 are five distinct sets which have been put together for no better reason, apparently, than that they were of the same approximate size. Again all the pages of Pen. 178 part 1 were drawn from various parts of what is now Pen. 177.

As already mentioned, Gruffudd Hiraethog was among the first to make tabular pedigrees in his manuscripts. These are even more difficult to decipher than his narrative pedigrees in most cases.

His chief distinction is in the frequent references to the authorities he is copying. Much of the material in his manuscripts is directly copied from earlier sources, which he often names, but a great deal of it seems to be the result of genuine 'visitations'. These are generally short and to the point, covering one or two pages. The normal pattern was to give the name of the *plas* with parish and *cwmwd*. Then the pedigree, in the male line, of the householder, followed by the pedigrees of the mothers of the immediate ancestors. Then the wife of the householder with her pedigree and perhaps that of her mother, followed by the names of their children with their wives, husbands and children, if any. Occasionally he gives the dates of birth of the children and the year of his visit. Also in the top of the left hand margin he

²² *Visitation of Shropshire*, ed. Harleian Society Publications No. 28, p. 391

²³ Pen. 287 p. 375.

sometimes entered a sum of money, presumably what he received for his work, e.g. xlii (Pen. 133 p. 174), vj ^{mork} (p. 199), 40(?) nobl (p. 182), and 'Siri tlawd' (p. 206). A short example of a 'visitation' is given in Appendix 3.

His copying of older material appears to be accurate in cases that I have been able to check, and one may therefore put some faith in cases where the original is lost. As was customary he used his own orthography. The visitations are of equal if not greater importance. Presumably he had to take the word of his informant and so the accuracy of his record has that limitation.

He must have travelled widely, for his visitations seem to have covered the whole of Wales.

J. G. Evans pointed out²⁴ that Gruffudd Hiraethog occasionally used figures to represent vowels, that is, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 55, and 7 for a, e, i, o, u, w and y. He also used 6 for w. Examples occur in Pen. 132 p. 169, Pen. 133 pp. 53, 81, 134 and 203. The first of these is quoted inaccurately at second hand and without explanation, in Harl. 2300 part 1 p. 9. The manuscript reads *K1r31d K1tr3n K4n557 t3p3n 15r* which is to be interpreted as *Kariad Katrin Konwy tipin aur*.

Wiliam Llŷn often filled in blank pages of Gruffudd Hiraethog's manuscripts with his own jottings. One has to be on the alert to notice this because his writing and orthography are very like those of Gruffudd Hiraethog. It may be noted that Wiliam Llŷn used a heavier hand, and his range of legibility is greater, from good to very bad. His abbreviation for *verch* differs from that of Gruffudd Hiraethog, and he normally wrote *John* and *vachan* while Gruffudd wrote *Jhon* and *vychan*. These idiosyncracies are generally sufficient to distinguish the two.

PENIARTH MS. 131

Peniarth MS. 131, of quarto size, includes the former Hengwrt MSS. 113 and 114 = 414. A study of the old folio numbers and the two indexes in this manuscript reveals a most complicated history. On some pages there are four different numbers. The manuscript consists of eight main sections:

- (A) pp. 3-10. Index by Wiliam Llŷn to sections B and C.
- (B) pp. 13-68 by Ieuan ap Madog ap Rhys (see p. 78 below), some time at the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII.

²⁴ RWM i. 973 note.

- (C) pp. 71-138 by Gutun Owain, c. 1475.
- (D) pp. 139-153 by an unknown writer before 1574 (RWM).
- (E) pp. 155-176 by Wiliam Llŷn and Simwnt Fychan.
- (F) pp. 177-188. A copy by Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt of (part of?) 'Y Llyfr Bychan o Vaesmor o waith a llaw Guttyn Owen.'
- (G) pp. 193-197. Index by Wiliam Llŷn to section H.
- (H) pp. 199-270, 273-308 by Ieuan Brechfa, c. 1500.

The earliest part is section C which had folio numbers 1-37(?). Sections B and C were bound together, perhaps by Wiliam Llŷn, who supplied an index (A) at the beginning, after re-numbering the folios 1-65. Then the last three folios of Gutun Owain's work were lost.

Section D has roman numerals for its folio numbers and their miscellaneous character suggests that the pages are an assortment from a much larger manuscript.

Sections D and E were next added to A, B and C, and the folios were re-numbered from 1 to 95. The first eight folios were later removed or lost, and there is no record of what they contained. At this stage, also, the first folio of Gutun Owain's work got torn out and was replaced by a blank page, now 69-70. This binding of sections A to E is apparently the manuscript as it belonged to Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt and was numbered Hengwrt 113.

Section H (Ieuan Brechfa) was also in the possession of Wiliam Llŷn, at which time the pages were in a different order, viz. the present 247-270, 273-308 followed by 199-246. At this time there were four lacunae and the folios were numbered xxxviiij-lxxxx, but two had the same number (lxxxj). These numbers were quoted by Gruffudd Hiraethog. (See e.g. Pen. 133 pp. 79, 83). They suggest that the manuscript was originally bound up with another, unless we suppose the loss of 37 folios of Ieuan Brechfa's work for which there is no certain evidence.²⁵ The error in the numbering of the folios was corrected by Wiliam Llŷn, using the numbers 38-90, but he made a similar mistake by numbering two folios 67. These arabic numbers are used in his index (G) but do not now appear on the actual pages. His index seems to have occupied seven folios. Soon after this a new set of folio numbers going from 1 to 61 was supplied, of which 1-7 probably comprised

²⁵ The fact that the greater part of pp. 292-301 is a repetition of pp. 217-225 suggests that the present MS. is a combination of two originally distinct MSS, by Ieuan Brechfa.

the index. (There are no numbers on the surviving index pages). Then the first four folios of the index were lost. It was probably Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt who re-arranged the folios of section H in the present order, and numbered them 1 to 54, in rectangular boxes. He also placed these numbers in a new column in what survived of the index. Robert Vaughan used these numbers in his quotations from *Ieuan Brechfa* in Pen. 287. This binding of sections G and H was evidently Hengwrt 114, also numbered 414.

Finally the two Hengwrt manuscripts 113 and 114 = 414 were bound together with Robert Vaughan's own contribution (F) to form the present Peniarth 131. In the process of binding, two blank folios were placed between F and G, and a slip of paper in the hand of Robert Vaughan got accidentally bound as pages 271-2 in the middle of H.

The contents of the various sections are as follows:

- (B) An important copy of the expanded Hanesyn Hen material (see EWGT p. 79) and pedigrees of *uchelwyr*, mainly of Tegeingl.
- (C) A re-arrangement, with some additions, of Hanesyn Hen material, and pedigrees of *uchelwyr* of north Wales and Powys.
- (D) Material mainly based on Gutun Owain's manuscripts. Pp. 139-142 are copied from Gutun Owain's lost manuscript of 1497. See above p. 64.
- (E) Miscellaneous pedigrees of *uchelwyr*. Pp. 155-8, 174 by Simwnt Fychan are neat. The rest, by Wiliam Llŷn, are very untidy.
- (F) See under Gutun Owain, p. 72.
- (H) A poor copy of part of the expanded Hanesyn Hen material, and pedigrees mainly of Deheubarth.

The authorship of section B can be deduced from two references by Gruffudd Hiraethog. In Pen. 177 p. 95 Gruffudd Hiraethog copied a section from fo. 22 *o lyfr Tudr ap Rs*, which actually comes from p. 24 of this manuscript (formerly fo. 22). In Pen. 176 p. 350 Gruffudd Hiraethog copied another passage from p. 53 of this manuscript which he describes as *yn llyfr Tudr ap Rs ap Dd o law Ieuan ap Mad' ap Rs*. Thus this section B evidently belonged to Tudur ap Rhys ap Dafydd and was in the hand of Ieuan ap Madog ap Rhys. This Ieuan ap Madog ap Rhys is the subject of the very pedigree on page 53. He was a man of Denbighshire, of the tribe of Hedd ab Alunog, and the pedigree suggests a date of c. 1470 for his birth. (see Pen. 287 p. 570).

PENIARTH MS. 129

Peniarth MS. 129, of quarto size, was formerly Hengwrt 455. It consists of four parts: — (A) pp. 1-3, (B) pp. 4-13, (C) pp. 14-134, written in or after 1500 (RWM), (D) pp. 141-151, by the same writer as that of Pen. 138. Pages 135-140 are blank.

Section B appears to have been a little later than section C, but the text is continuous with that of C and seems to have been written to fill a gap due to the loss of the initial pages of the manuscript. Section A is later still and is now in poor condition. It is of no value, being little more than the jottings of someone who found some blank sheets of paper on which to scribble.

J. G. Evans stated in RWM that pp. 14-134 were in the hand of Gutun Owain, but this is definitely not so, as was pointed out by Thomas Roberts.²⁶ There are also peculiarities of orthography not found in Gutun Owain's work, for example wrong division of words such as *ar isiart* for *a Risiart*, *ac wraic* for *a gwraic*, and *Llevgv* for *Llevcv*. The writing is neat, and easy to read, but there are some careless errors in copying. Pages 4-52 are copied from Gutun Owain's lost manuscript of 1497,²⁷ and this may explain the ascription of the manuscript to Gutun Owain. At the point corresponding to p. 52 Thomas Chaloner entered in Harl. 1970 his note that he had copied word for word from a book in the hand of Gutun Owain. However Harl. 1970 and Pen. 129 continue almost identically up to page 98 of Pen. 129, at which point Harl. 1970 breaks off. It seems that the manuscript copied must have contained all this material but presumably the latter part was in a different hand. Another copy at second hand of Gutun Owain's lost manuscript, made by Owen Jones (Myfyr) in BM. Add. 15002 pp. 345-407, corresponds to pages 22-67 of Pen. 129. This copy preserves on p. 377 the date, 1497, presumably of Gutun Owain's manuscript.

Pages 62, 63 of Pen. 129 are an insertion which interferes with the continuity and does not appear in the other copies. There are no old folio numbers in the manuscript.

PENIARTH MS. 127

Peniarth MS. 127, folio, is in two parts: —

Part 1 = pp. 1-256 (= Hengwrt 194) in the hand of 'Syr'

Thomas ap Ieuan ap Deicws, written between 1510 and 1523.

Part 2 = pp. 257-288 (= Hengwrt 443) dated by RWM 1531-1544.

²⁶ BBCS xv, p. 109 (1953).

²⁷ See above p. 64.

Part 2 is not of great importance genealogically. Genealogy occupies pages 264-277 and 284-288, and much of it is a repetition of what occurs in part 1. It is in poor condition and badly faded in parts. Its chief interest is the earliest extant appearance of the tribal groupings 'Pump costowglwyth Kymry' and 'Tair beriach Gwynedd'.²⁸ I should add here a point that I missed in PP₁, namely that these two groupings appear in exactly the same form in Mostyn 113 p. 100, which although written in 1572, is said to have been copied from a manuscript of 'Syr' John Powys, written c. 1514.²⁹ This places their first appearance some twenty years earlier.

Part 1 of Pen. 127 is a beautifully written manuscript partly rubricated and with provision for rubrication throughout. The author tells us about himself and his family very fully on pp. 110-114.³⁰ He was the son of Ieuan ap Deicws 'yr hwn a elwid Dafydd yn iawn' ap Cynwrig ap Iorwerth ap Cynwrig ab Ithel. He makes no attempt to hitch his pedigree to any well known 'patriarch'. But his mother belonged to the tribe of Tudur Trefor and his wife to that of Rhirid Flaidd. For more on Thomas ap Ieuan and his writings see Thomas Jones in *Trans. Cym.* 1943-4, pp. 35-61. He was clearly a careful compiler of pedigrees and no mere copyist. He compared his sources and remarked on differences. For example he gives two versions of the pedigree of Y Penwyn (p. 21) and of Philip Dorddu (p. 171). He was worried about the Irish (or rather Norse) names in the pedigree of Gruffudd ap Cynan's mother:

Ac yn yr ach honn y mae peth ymravael yn yr ennwev ac nid rryvedd i vod yn yr enwev Gwyddelic hynn. Canys o Iwerddon ir hanoedd mam Gruffudd ap Kynan ac ni vedrai y Kymrv gadw na dywedud enwev y Gwyddyl yn iawn. (p. 74).

The pages of the manuscript were never numbered until J. G. Evans numbered them. One or more folios have been lost at the beginning of several sections, i.e. before pages 65, 117, 155, 163, and a folio has been lost between pages 178 and 179. Some of the pages are out of order. Thus pages 115-6 should come after 162 and 239-256 before 205. Pages 191-2 are an insertion which interferes with the continuity. There is also evidence from references in the text that other sections were originally arranged in a different order.

²⁸ See PP₁ p. 125.

²⁹ See Appendix 5.

³⁰ A photograph of p. 110 is given in Plate 2. Some additional information about his family occurs in Pen. 138 p. 572 and Pen. 176 pp. 47, 91.

More or less verbatim copies of Pen. 127 part 1 occur in Gwysaney MS. 23 (mid-16th century) and, probably copied thence, in Brogyntyn MS. 15 (c. 1593), both in the National Library of Wales. These enable us to fill some gaps in Pen. 127 and to determine the correct order of the pages. See the article by E. D. Jones in *The National Library of Wales Journal*, VII, p. 85. Other copies of major portions of Pen. 127 part 1 are contained in BM. Add. 14916, 'Llyfr Bodeulwyn', 1579, and in BM. Add. 15041. The latter is in the same hand, and has the same ornamentation in green and red as Pen. 138 (c. 1562). The first 46 folios (modern numbering) of Llyfr Bodeulwyn are also in this hand but without the coloured ornamentation.³¹

It may be of interest to mention that the verses on the Five Royal Tribes and the Fifteen Tribes of Gwynedd appear in this manuscript, pages 1 and 4 respectively, much earlier than supposed by Francis Jones.³²

The manuscript seems to have been at one time in the possession of Simwnt Fychan, for Gruffudd Hiraethog mentions '[Llyfr] Syr Tomas ap Ieuan ap Dekws gida Simwnt' as his authority in Pen. 176 p. 354. The passage quoted, however, is not in the surviving text of Pen. 127. This, or another manuscript by Thomas ap Ieuan ap Deicws, was known to Gruffudd Hiraethog as 'Y Llyfr Llydan o Drefor'. See Pen. 177 p. 41.

Hugh Thomas refers (c. 1700) to a manuscript by Thomas ap Ieuan which had belonged to Sir Richard Wynn of Gwydir. Which Sir Richard is not clear. By 1717 it had passed to Sir John Wynn of Watstay, the fifth baronet. See Rachel Bromwich, *Trioedd Ynys Prydein* pp. xli - xliii. It is curious that the words 'Richard Wynne 1726' appear at the foot of page 17 of Pen. 127. In PP₁ p. 144 I suggested that the manuscript in question was actually Pen. 127 part 1. This was apparently a late addition to the Hengwrt Collection and does not seem to have been known to Robert Vaughan.

PENIARTH MS. 128

Peniarth MS. 128, formerly Hengwrt 308, is inscribed 'Llyver Edward ap Roger'. It is of folio size and the pages are numbered up to 942, quite a number of which are blank, however. According to J. G. Evans in RWM it was mostly written before 1565 but

³¹ It would be interesting to know the identity of the writer of Pen. 138. Besides BM. Add. 14916 and BM. Add. 15041, there are pages in his hand in Pen. 129 (pp. 141-151) (see above p. 79), Pen. 139 part 1 (pp. 271-282) and Pen. 139 part 2 (pp. 403-410).

³² Cf. AWG p. 371 and p. 333 note 1.

additions were made in the same hand, using paler ink down to 1581. It is not known for certain whether the hand, which is small and neat, is that of Edward ap Roger himself, who died in 1587, but it may well be. There are several other contemporary hands, and rubrications on most pages. The manuscript is often quoted by Gruffudd Hiraethog (e.g. Pen. 132 pp. 183, 252, Pen. 133 pp. 130, 142) and, from the many other references to it, it may be concluded that it was a well known and valued collection even while it was being compiled.

On Edward ap Roger see DWB. His own pedigree occurs in a middle section of the manuscript (pp. 296-567) from which we learn that he was the son of Roger ap John ab Elis Eutyn³³ of Eyton in Erbistog, Maelor Cymraeg, and a descendant of Meilir Eutun ab Elidir ap Rhys Sais of the tribe of Tudur Trefor. This elaborate pedigree branches backwards through mothers in every conceivable direction and nearly every branch has its coat of arms shown in colour.³⁴ The rest of the manuscript consists mainly of pedigrees in the normal narrative form of the time, two columns to a page. It shows some signs of planning. For example the first part is concerned with royal pedigrees covering early times. Bonedd y Saint, and the like, much of which was drawn directly or indirectly from Gutun Owain. Pages 2-4 are copied from Ieuan Brechfa's work, the original of which we still have in Pen. 131, and show that the copying was carefully done. After this more traditional matter come the pedigrees of the *uchelwyr*. These are normally arranged with one family to a page. The contemporary head of the family is first given with his pedigree in the male line and his children. Then the pedigrees of mothers in the usual way. If the information was scanty, space was left for later additions. In some cases the pedigree was continued on the *verso*, in others a new pedigree was begun on the second column or on the *verso*.

The manuscript is a valuable source of information for north Wales and Powys but it is relatively poor for other parts. It was used by Peter Ellis for his comprehensive compilation. See below p. 84. Peter Ellis and after him Robert Vaughan quote the folio numbers found in rectangular 'boxes' in the manuscript. These may have been supplied by Peter Ellis himself. The first surviving folio is numbered 10 so that nine folios have evidently been lost at the beginning. The numbering is occasionally irrational in that in five places two sides of a folio have consecutive numbers. There are two folios numbered 63 and two numbered 245. The following

³³ See also Pen. 287 p. 103.

³⁴ This part, according to RWM, was by William Cynwal (d. 1578/9).

folios are missing: 74-97, 182, 183, 407-414, 420 and 452. On the other hand J. G. Evans's page-numbering seems to have faltered as there are no pages numbered 95, 96, 277 and 278. The numbering of the folios is extremely valuable because it enables us to check the accuracy of Peter Ellis and Robert Vaughan in their work of compilation, with favourable results.

THE COMPREHENSIVE COMPILATIONS

1 *Peter Ellis*

Apparently the first person to draw up Welsh pedigrees in an attempt to give all the known descendants of each particular patriarch was Peter Ellis of Wrexham, or of Bersham in the same parish. According to John Pym Yeatman, Peter Ellis was an attorney of Staple Inn and was admitted to Gray's Inn in 1608. His will was proved in 1637.³⁵ His main work is contained in BM Add. MSS. 28033-4 and is inscribed '*Petri Ellis ICT^u Maelorensis Armigeri Corpus Genealogicum inchoatum destinatum nondum consummatum*'. Yeatman believed that Edward Puleston was the chief author of the Peter Ellis book.³⁶ This, I think, can be ruled out because, as we shall see, Edward Puleston's book (EP) is listed in the third person as one of the authorities used. For reasons given below (p. 86) it is certain that the work was done by Peter Ellis himself. It is a monument of industry. Peter Ellis wrote in a neat hand not unlike that of Robert Vaughan. The pedigrees are semi-tabular in form. That is to say, the names are written under each other, one to a line, and the relationships are shown by marginal links on the left. Marginal links are also used to indicate continuation on another page. An advantage of this method is that there is room for writing information about a person on the same line (or on lines below) without interfering with the layout. A disadvantage is that it is not easy to discern the relationships between individuals on the same, or different pages, unlike a well drawn tabular pedigree of the usual type, where contemporaries would be roughly at the same level. What makes the work particularly valuable is the fact that for marriages cross-references are given to the pages on which a wife's or husband's ancestry can be found. The chief drawback is the fact that it was obviously a first working draft (note the title) which grew gradually as more material came his way. Thus on page 13

³⁵ *Arch. Camb.* 1900, p. 285.

³⁶ *ibid.* p. 287.

(I use his own page numbering when possible) he begins the tribe of Edwin of Tegeingl and continues to page 14, but many more descendants are found on later pages, where we find scraps of genealogy, all nevertheless with proper cross-references to the pages where they should be connected. He also gives his authorities in most cases. These are designated by letters, EP, ER, Ell, etc. followed by a number. There is no key to these abbreviations in the manuscript, but there is no doubt that the key in question is that found in Pen. 287 pp. xxxvii - viii. See further on this below p. 85. It is clear that ER, Llyfr Edward ap Roger (Pen. 128), was his main source of information. At the beginning (fos. 4^r to 9^r) he has a comprehensive index of key names and places with page references in most cases. In a few cases there is no page reference but a code reference to a manuscript or other source. This was obviously part of his process of drawing together information from different sources to form a tabular pedigree. There are other evidences of the same process on rough pages bound into the manuscript (fos. 10^v of Vol. 1 and 137^r to 139^r of Vol. 2).

One of the pitfalls which threaten a compiler of comprehensive pedigrees who is making use of earlier pedigrees from various authorities results from inconsistencies in his source. If, for example, a name is omitted in one version of a pedigree and not in another, or if two pedigrees differ in more serious respects, there is a good chance that the same family may be entered twice or even more times differently linked to the main tree, and sometimes even linked to a different tree. This is most likely to occur in the case of the lesser known families, and in Peter Ellis's book there are several examples. Sometimes the fact has been noticed and a note made, but more often the fact has remained unnoticed.³⁷

Peter Ellis's genealogical material covers mainly north Wales and Powys, evidently because most of his authorities were manuscripts of this area. The scanty data which he gave for south Wales and Radnorshire seem to be mainly accidental information contained in his northern sources.

There are a few additions to the manuscript in other hands, for example, pp. 394-7 (see below p. 96), and in the index.

Peter Ellis occasionally entered dates which he evidently obtained from deeds and the like. He gave references of the form A5, B4, which seems to indicate some manuscript in his possession.

³⁷ These remarks apply also to George Clark's *Limbus Patrum Morganiae et Glamorganiae* which was evidently compiled from disparate sources in a similar way.

Peter Ellis's pedigree is given in Harl. 1972 p. 283 = fo. 86^r. Here he is called 'Peter Ellis of Wrexham, lerned in lawes, a good antiquary, 1636', son of Ellis ap Richard ap Ellis of Hope ap Gruffudd [Llwyd]³⁸ ap Gwyn ap Gronwy, of the tribe of Sandde Hardd of Bortun. He also appears in Cardiff MS. 45 p. 181 as 'Peter Ellise, learned in the laws, [of] Hope-medach[ed]'. His pedigree is also given in Pen. 287 p. 157. Nothing is there said of him, but he is given the rare honour of having his name PETER in capitals. In BM. 28033 p. 8 the pedigree is only carried down to Richard, and even that is a later addition. This is somewhat surprising if Peter Ellis was the original compiler of the manuscript, but it should be remembered that the manuscript was 'nondum consummatum'.

It was stated above that the list of authorities used by Peter Ellis is that in Pen. 287, Robert Vaughan's Book of Pedigrees, pp. xxxvii - xxxviii. As this does not seem to have been realized before it is desirable that reasons should be given. First of all though the hand is that of Robert Vaughan, it appears to be a verbatim copy of a list made by Peter Ellis, as will be seen in the quotations below. These quotations are chosen because they seem to be almost conclusive evidence. The full list of authorities is given, not quite literally, by J. G. Evans in RWM i. 1102-3, but he has changed the order so as to be alphabetic.

- EPE My owne collections here in folio principally out of EP his booke. [EP = Edward Puleston].
- HH A petegree drawne by Cynwal for my coosin H. Hughes second wife, the grandchilde of Harry ap Ieuan Lloid.
- Hy A booke of Humff. Yong of Croxton lent by my coosin Edward Lloid of Bersham.
- RW Traditions et relations *per* Robt vychan of Wengraig.

Further, in BM. Add. 28034 fo. 133^r Peter Ellis writes:

A brief abstract of such visitinges as I had from my cosin Hugh Lloid of Hope.

We know from Pen. 287 pp. 156-7 that Peter Ellis had cousins with the surname Lloyd, while to the best of my knowledge Robert Vaughan did not. The use of the first person under HH and Hy above, and the mention of Robert Vaughan by name under RW seem to be conclusive evidence that the list was made

³⁸ Gruffudd Llwyd was of Hope. Most of his descendants took the surname Lloyd. See Pen. 287 pp. 156-8. See PF v. 256 for a little information on this family.

by Peter Ellis. It is also fairly certain that EPE is based on the letters EP and PE, that is Edward Puleston and Peter Ellis. It may be added that nearly all the authorities mentioned come from places within easy reach of Wrexham, and only RW from Merioneth.

The only source in the list which seems to have been added by Robert Vaughan himself is the last, which appears in paler ink, namely,

D Llyfr Achau y Deheudir o law Rob. Vaughan.

It is disconcerting to find that Robert Vaughan refers to himself here in the third person, but this manuscript was not begun until after the death of Peter Ellis as we learn from a letter by Robert Vaughan to John Cain, dated 1 December 1646:

I have laboured this half yeare & more to make a booke of the petegrees of the gentlemen of Southwales, but haveing noe more help but Gruffyth Hiraethogs books and those differing one from an other, it gives me little content yett ev'y thing must have a beginning...

Dolgelley, 1 Dec. 1646

Robt. Vaughan.³⁹

The manuscript is not known to me, but some of the working sheets for it are evidently those found at the beginning of Peniarth 132, which contain pedigrees in semi-tabular form, based almost wholly on Peniarth 133 as the references prove.

Proof that BM. Add. 28033-4 is actually in the hand of Peter Ellis was not easy to find. One small indication turned up unexpectedly as follows. In Pen. 128 p. 901 = folio 497^r we find 'Mam John Edwards ap Willm Ed's oedd Katrin vch John Hwks ap *Thomas Hookes*'. The italics are an addition in a later hand. This entry is referred to by Robert Vaughan in Pen. 287 p. 67 s.n. Wiliam Edwards as follows: 'John Hooks ap *Tho ER 497 llaw PE*'. The italics are a later addition by Robert Vaughan and indicate that the addition in Pen. 128 is in the hand of Peter Ellis. But this addition in Pen. 128 is almost certainly in the same hand as that of BM. Add. 28033-4. If so it follows that Peter Ellis himself was the compiler of BM. Add. 28033-4. The two words *Thomas Hookes* were not much to go on, but they were an encouraging pointer. However, much more satisfactory proof is available in the bond signed by Robert Vaughan. See below p. 88.

³⁹ Thesis by Thomas Emrys Parry, 'Llythyrau Robert Vaughan, Hengwrt, (1592-1667)', 1960, in the National Library of Wales, 1961/40. Letter no. 20, p. 271, from Pen. 327 part 2, p. 133.

2. *Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt*

As a genealogist Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt (1592?-1667) is best known for his manuscript known as *Llyfr Achau Robert Vaughan*, formerly Hengwrt MS. 96, now Peniarth 287, in two folio volumes. The manuscript is beautifully written and the pedigrees are in semi-tabular form with marginal links like those of Peter Ellis (see Plate 3). If this had been wholly the work of Robert Vaughan it would be impressive indeed, but there can be no doubt that it was mainly based on the work of Peter Ellis. The chief difference is that it has been put into much more systematic order. Minor parts in BM. Add. 28033-4 have been omitted and there are considerable additions. The pages are numbered 1-700 (Vol. 1) and 709-1439 (Vol. 2). A certain amount of re-numbering has been carried out which leads to confusion in a few places. The chief additions are taken from those of Gruffudd Hiraethog's manuscripts which were in the Hengwrt library and a lost manuscript by Lewys and James Dwnn covering Montgomeryshire. (See below p. 96). Robert Vaughan gave the same authorities in his text as Peter Ellis (sometimes supplemented) and often makes the same errors. Like Peter Ellis he gave cross-references for marriages — a most important fact.

The lost list of authorities, with their abbreviations, drawn up by Peter Ellis for BM. Add. 28033-4, was copied verbatim by Robert Vaughan in Pen. 287 pp. xxxvii-viii, as already mentioned. This does not of course include the additional authorities used by Robert Vaughan. In a curiously similar way the list of additional authorities used by Robert Vaughan, written in his own hand, now appears in Harl. 2299 fo. 3^v, a manuscript which is a copy of part of Pen. 287. As this list may be of some interest to users of Pen. 287 it is given in Appendix 4.

Robert Vaughan's index is an exact copy of that made by Peter Ellis in BM. Add. 28033 (except for a few additions in the latter made by a later hand), but as is natural in a copy, it is tidier, the orthography is different, and of course the page references are different.

Further proof, if it were needed, that Robert Vaughan used Peter Ellis's book appears in minor points. For example on p. 939 of Pen. 287 the cross-reference for 'Angharad vch Cynwrig ap Howel' is given *in pencil* as p. 405. This is the page in BM. Add. 28033 not in Pen. 287.⁴⁰ It is evident that Robert Vaughan omitted to enter his own cross-reference in this instance, and this slight slip shows something of his method of working.

⁴⁰ Similarly on p. 844 of Pen. 287, a pencil reference to p. 419 of BM. Add. 28034.

The handwritings of Peter Ellis and Robert Vaughan seem similar even when seen side by side. But there are marked differences in style and orthography. Peter Ellis generally used English if he wished to record an anecdote while Robert Vaughan records the same anecdote in Welsh. Peter Ellis often spells Welsh names in an English manner, for example, 'Mathavarne', 'David ap Rees of Combe', but Robert Vaughan changes these to 'Mathafarn', 'Dd ap Rys or Cwm'.

Like Peter Ellis's book, Robert Vaughan's deals mainly with north Wales and Powys. South Wales and Radnorshire are poorly represented although on the whole it is fuller for those regions than Peter Ellis's book.

Two copies of Pen. 287 were made in later hands. One is Pen. 288 (formerly Hengwrt 324), a large heavy tome. The page numbers correspond only roughly, and pp. 872-1084 and 1098-1136 are missing. It follows Pen. 287 up to p. 1160 (= p. 1157 of Pen. 288). The last numbered page, 1158, contains additional matter not in Pen. 287. After this there is an index, different from that of Pen. 287. Cross-references for marriages are consequently not given, but it contains full references to authorities as in Pen. 287. According to RWM this copy was probably made by Gruffudd, fourth son of Robert Vaughan. The second copy of Pen. 287 is in three folio volumes:

Harl. 2299 (= Pen. 287 Index + pp. 1-544). This once belonged to Hugh Thomas.

Pen. 285, 286 (formerly Hengwrt 359, 360) = Pen. 287 pp. 556-964, 973-1391. (Pp. 965-972 of Pen. 287 are blank, and there are no pages properly numbered 545-555).

This is a reasonably accurate copy, except that many of the references to authorities have been omitted. Care has been taken to keep the pages corresponding so that the cross-references could be, and were, entered as they stood. The hand is large and often untidy, however, and the marginal links are sometimes difficult to decipher and sometimes wrong. It is a great pity that this set is split between two libraries. How much more useful it would have been if they had all been at the British Museum.

In 1638, the year after the death of Peter Ellis, Robert Vaughan entered into a bond of £200 whereby he undertook to redeliver to the executors of Peter Ellis five books of pedigrees in folio. Three of these, in the hand of Peter Ellis, contained 670 folios, and another was also in his hand.⁴¹ The three volumes containing

⁴¹ Pen. 326, bundle 3, last sheet. See reference by E. D. Jones in *The Journal of the Merioneth Historical and Record Society*, I. 24.

670 pages are almost certainly now BM. Add. MSS. 28033-4 which contain 670 numbered pages, but are now bound in two volumes. The other volume in the hand of Peter Ellis was perhaps that which he refers to as EPE. See above p. 85. It is not clear whether Robert Vaughan had already borrowed the books before the death of Peter Ellis. In Pen. 287 he refers only occasionally to the books of Peter Ellis, for example on pages xxix, 67, 531, 665, 1365, where he uses the abbreviation PE. But his debt to Peter Ellis seems to have been much greater than he ever acknowledged. I have found only one reference to Peter Ellis in his correspondence, in an undated letter: 'the which note I had out of Mr. Petter Ellis his bookes as I thingk'.⁴²

It appears that Robert Vaughan was already working on his genealogical book in 1646, if we can assume that it is 'my booke' which he mentions in a letter to Siôn Cain in that year.⁴³ It was probably fairly complete by 1658 as it is mentioned by William Maurice in his catalogue of the Hengwrt library made in that year.

3. *Griffith Hughes*

For information about Griffith Hughes, see John Pym Yeatman's articles in *Notes and Queries*, 16 February, 1901, pp. 131-2 and *Arch. Camb.* 1901 pp. 126 f., and Francis Jones in AWG p. 418. He was a deputy Herald, apparently living in the period 1634 to 1665. He was the author of Harl. 1969 which contains pedigrees in the semi-tabular form with marginal links. It is very neatly written and systematically arranged. It is clearly based to a large extent on Peter Ellis's book but some material has been added. Griffith Hughes uses the same abbreviations as Peter Ellis for his authorities but he gives no key to these and his references are fewer. Most of the errors in Peter Ellis's book are reproduced. Of the additional sources, one is indicated by the abbreviation JJ which I have been able to identify as Pen. 138. The main part of the work is concerned with the Five Royal Tribes and the Fifteen Tribes of Gwynedd, but in addition it includes the descendants of Gwaithfoed of Ceredigion, Gwaithfoed of Meirionydd, Rhirid Flaidd, Llowdden of Uwch Aeron (attached to the tribe of Edwin) and Tudur Trefor (not completed). At the end are a number of pedigrees of Herefordshire families.

Unfortunately very few cross-references are given for marriages,

⁴² Thesis by T. E. Parry, (see note 40), letter no. 79, p. 447.

⁴³ *ibid.* p. 74.

generally only such as appear on nearby pages. This considerably reduces its value, because it is often impossible to identify the family of the husband or wife mentioned. Perhaps Griffith Hughes intended to compile another book dealing with other groups of families, and then to enter all cross-references. It is a pity that he did not at least enter the cross-reference to pages in this particular volume.

Griffith Hughes gave his own pedigree on p. 281 of Harl. 1969 (not page or folio 239 as stated by Yeatman). From this we learn that he was 'of Llanverres, Deputie for the office of Armes', ap Hugh ap Richard ap Rhys ap Llywelyn ap Bel, etc. of the tribe of Edwin of Tegeingl.

4 *Cardiff MS. 45*

Cardiff MS. 45 (as listed in RWM) was formerly Phillipps 11188 and is now numbered Cardiff 3.8. Although not comprehensive to the same extent as the other manuscripts discussed under this heading, it contains a very complete set of pedigrees of Flintshire, dated 1630 (not 1639 as stated in RWM). The manuscript is of vellum, unusual at this date, and the pedigrees are neatly drawn up in semi-tabular form with marginal links. They are very systematically arranged under 'patriarchs', and there are ample cross-references to other pages for marriages, etc. There is also a good index of place-names.

At one time J. G. Evans thought that the manuscript was in the same hand as Pen. 288 (above p. 88).⁴⁴ Later he stated that it was by Peter Ellis.⁴⁵ Neither of these statements is correct, as is shown by comparison with a photostat copy. The style is very similar to that of Griffith Hughes, and so is the hand, but there are minor differences of orthography which seem to rule out the possibility that it was by him, unless we suppose that it was an early work of his and that he later changed his habits of spelling. Although Griffith Hughes was from Llanferres in Denbighshire, he was closely related to Flintshire families included in this manuscript. One feels that if he had written the manuscript he would hardly have resisted the temptation of adding the few extra lines necessary to include his own name. This was not done, and the conclusion must be that it cannot be ascribed to Griffith Hughes without further evidence.

⁴⁴ RWM *sub* Cardiff 45, dated 1903.

⁴⁵ RWM *sub* Pen. 287, dated 1905.

5. *David Edwardes of Rhyd-y-Gors*

David Edwardes (c. 1630-1690) did for south Wales and Radnorshire what Peter Ellis and Robert Vaughan did for north Wales and Powys. For his life and family see DWB and AWG pp. 419-421 and 460. He arranged his pedigrees in volumes according to county, and in each individual county he grouped them under patriarchs. The pedigrees are in ordinary tabular form, somewhat untidy but easily legible, and they are fully cross-referenced either to pages in the same volume or to pages in another volume, e.g. 'Glam. p. 41'. His fullest and most important volumes are those dealing with south Wales, but they actually covered the whole of Wales and more. Some of his manuscripts are in the Bodleian Library, bound into three folio volumes:

- Add. C. 177 Radnorshire, Montgomeryshire, and Cardiganshire.
- C. 178 Carmarthenshire.
- C. 179 Monmouthshire.

The three counties bound together in Add. C. 177 are incomplete. Radnorshire has lost pp. 9-12, 25-28, 49-52, at least, and now ends at p. 74. Montgomeryshire contains only pages 65-117. Cardiganshire has lost pages 1-20, 73-76, 81-95, at least, and now ends at p. 80. The volumes for Carmarthenshire and Monmouthshire appear to be complete, but pages 1 and 2 of the Carmarthenshire volume have been bound after p. 170. A fair copy of the Carmarthenshire volume is now the first part of Harl. 2300. It is, I believe, in David Edwardes's own hand, and the page numbers and cross-reference are identical. It is certainly not by Hugh Thomas as stated by Edward Owen in his catalogue, although it belonged to Hugh Thomas at one time.

The Pembrokeshire book is in the College of Arms, Protheroe MS. V, pp. 21-191. It has lost pages 1-20. The main part of the Breconshire book is also at the College of Arms, Protheroe MS. IV, namely pages 1-80, 185-240, 283-306. Cross-references from his other manuscripts show that the Breconshire book originally contained at least 309 pages. William Lewes remarked in 1709 that some 100 pages were missing.⁴⁶ It is evident that David Edwardes's book suffered grievously at the hands of his successors.

The works of David Edwardes formed the main basis of the pedigrees drawn up by Hugh Thomas and William Lewes, both of

⁴⁶ AWG p. 412.

whom added material and brought up to date. Hugh Thomas often quotes the cross-references of David Edwardes to other county volumes. Through William Lewes the work of David Edwardes found its way into the Golden Grove Book, in which it was re-arranged to a large extent. See p. 93.

Thus it may be supposed that most of David Edwardes's lost work has survived in some form in copies, but in many cases the cross-references have been lost, and it is often difficult to reconstruct these. Fortunately, however, verbatim copies of some of the books of David Edwardes, or parts thereof, with identical pagination and cross-references, were made in the Golden Grove Book as follows:

Glamorgan 1 - 28 = GG 2041 - 2068.

Glamorgan 13 - 309 = GG 439 - 743. (Several cases of mis-numbering)

Breconshire 1 - 34 = GG 2069 - 2103.

Denbighshire 5 - 46 = GG 1191 - 1232.

Caernarvonshire 1 - 44 = GG 1233 - 1272. Pages 29 - 32 missing

Anglesey 1 - 40 = GG 1273 - 1312.

Merioneth 5 - 70 = GG 1313 - 1372. (Pages 52 - 57 missing).

The north Wales Books do not compare in detail and accuracy with those of Peter Ellis and Robert Vaughan, but they give information not contained in the latter, such as occasional collateral lines and additional generations.

David Edwardes often gave dates in his pedigrees, most of which seem to have been drawn from legal documents. Other material by him, of less importance and much of it in a tattered and fragmentary state, is held at the College of Arms. It has been listed by Major Francis Jones in his 'Report on the Welsh Manuscripts contained in the muniments of the College of Arms', typescript, 1957.

Unfortunately David Edwardes seldom gives authorities. Occasionally we find such remarks as: 'As Gr[ufudd] H[iraethog]', 'As W^m Brunett', but these are not normally very helpful.

6. *The Golden Grove Book*

The Golden Grove Book is the last of the comprehensive manuscript compilations. It consists of three folio volumes with pages numbered consecutively in red from 1 to 2103, together with a fourth, index, volume. These are now in the Public Record Office. Much about the history of the book is given by Francis Jones in

AWG pp. 414 and 456-463, from which we learn that it is a fair copy made about 1765 by an unknown writer of a compilation by William Lewes of Llwynderw (1652-1722).

It is neatly written and is based to a large extent on the work of David Edwardes with additions by Hugh Thomas, William Lewes and others. It also contains verbatim copies of parts of the county volumes of David Edwardes as already mentioned. As a result there is a considerable amount of duplication. William Lewes had planned to ignore county boundaries (except for the 'Advenae') and to give all the descendants of one patriarch together, as had been done by Robert Vaughan and Griffith Hughes for north Wales. Further he planned to group the families together into 'super-tribes' according to the supposed descents of some of the patriarchs from common ancestors. They are grouped as follows: Tewdwr Mawr (pp. 1-52), Gruffudd ap Cynan (53-60), Tudwal ap Rhodri Mawr (61-115), Urien Rheged (137-180), Gwyddno Garanhir (407-427), Brychan (749-770), Kradoc Vreichfras (1377-1590), 'Gwaethvoed' (1605-1710), Brochwel 'Yscythroc' (1735-1746). Many families, however, could not be neatly classified in this way and had to be given small sections of their own. The 'Advenae' were grouped according to county. Each of these individual sections was given its own separate pagination which was used in the rare cross-references. The grandiose plan was not completely carried out and this may account for the paucity of cross-references for marriages, except in those parts which were verbatim copies from David Edwardes, in which case his own cross-references are given. Occasionally, even in those parts which are not direct copies from David Edwardes, cross-references to the books of David Edwardes are given.

Just as in the case of David Edwardes's books the Golden Grove Book is fullest and most reliable for south Wales. It is chiefly useful for information concerning the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but must be treated with caution for earlier material as it contains the accumulated errors of past centuries, as well as unsubstantiated guesses by Hugh Thomas and others.

There is a copy of the greater part of the Golden Grove Book in the National Library of Wales, Castell Gorfod Collection, Nos. 7 and 12, and another in the College of Arms.

APPENDIX 1

ASCENDING PEDIGREE BY GUTUN OWAIN

[Pen. 131 p. 94]

[COETMOR]

Robert ap *Ieuan* vychan ap Madoc ap *Howel* ap *Gruffudd* ap *Dafydd* ap Tudur ap Madoc ap Iarddur ap [*Kynddelw ap*] Trehaiarn ap Bod ap Kysgen.

Mam Robert ap *Ieuan* vychan oedd Wladus verch *Ieuan* llwyd ap *Gruffudd* ap Gronwy.

Mam Wladus oedd Vared verch *Gruffudd* vychan ap *Gruffudd* ap *Dafydd* goch.

Mam *Ieuan* vychan oedd Vargred verch *Ieuan* ap *Einion* ap *Gruffudd* ap *Howel* ap Meredudd ap [*Einion ap*] Gwgon.

Mam *Ieuan* ap *Einion* oedd Nest verch *Gruffudd* ap Adda.

Gwraic *Ieuan* ap *Einion* oedd Wenhwyvar verch Y Mab [*Einion*].

Yr un Vargred verch *Ieuan* ap *Einion* oedd vam Rys vy[chan] ap Rrys ap *Llywelyn* ap Kadwgon ai vrodyr *Howel* a *Meredydd*.

APPENDIX 2

DESCENDING PEDIGREE BY GUTUN OWAIN

[Pen. 131 p. 98]

NANNAV

Plant Mevric llwyd ap Mevric vychan ap Ynyr vychan ap Ynyr ap Mevric ap Madoc ap Kadwgon ap Bleddyn ap Kynvyn:

Howel selyf a *Gruffudd* derwas a Gwenhwyvar [mam] Meredud[d] vychan o Veilienydd ai vrodyr, a mam pedair merched *Ieuan* llwyd ap *Gruffudd* ap Gronwy, a Nest mam Ithel ap *Dafydd* ap Kynwric o Deg [aingl a] Rrys ap Mevric llwyd.

Plant *Howel* selyf: Meuric vychan a Mallt gwraic *Gruffudd* ap Siankyn ap *Llywelyn* ap *Einion* ap Kelyn[in], a Gwladus gwraic *Gruffudd* ap *Llywelyn* ap *Gruffudd*, a Llevk[v verch?] *Howel*, Gwenllian, Mallt.

Plant *Gruffudd* derwas: *Howel* a Gwilym; o verch[ed]: Mallt gwraic *Gruffudd* ap Rrobyn, a Gwenllian g[wraic] Morgant ap *Ieuan* ap *Meredydd* o Lyn, ac Yngharad gwraic *Dafydd* ap *Llywelyn* vychan ap *Llywelyn* ap Kynwric ap *Ieuan* o Degaingl. Mam Yngharad oedd Wenhwyvar Ystanlai. Elliw verch *Gruffudd* derwas oedd wraic Jankyn ap Iorwerth ap [*Einion*]. Ac Wenllian verch *Gruffudd* derwas vchod oedd hynaf merch ac a ddyweddwyd yn gyntaf *Ieuan* ap Rrys ap I[*euan*] ap *Gruffudd* ap *Howel* ap *Meredydd* o Eddionydd, ac vddvnt [i bv] ddav

vab a merch, nid amgen, *Gruffudd*, *Madoc*, *An[gharad]* gwraic *Robert* ap *Ieuan* vychan o *Goettmor*; ac wedi marw *Ieuan* ap *Rrys* i priodes hi *Vorgant* [ap *Ieuan*] ap *Meredydd* o *Lyn*, ac vddvnt i bv *Llywelyn* ap *Mo[rgant]*. [p. 99] *Mam* *Meuric* vychan ap *Ynyr* oedd *Wenhwyvar* *verch* *Gruffudd* ap *Gwen*.

Plant *Mevric* vychan: *Howel* ap *Mevric* a *Mevric* llwyd a *Gruffudd* llwyd a *Ieuan* a *Llywelyn* ddv ac *Ynyr* llwyd. Yw *mam* oedd *Wladus* *verch* *Gruffudd* ap *Ywain* ap *Bleddyn* ap *Ywain* Brogvntvn.

APPENDIX 3

'VISITATION' BY GRUFFUDD HIRAETHOG

[Pen. 133 p.51]

YSTRAD GILERCHAN YN HIRFRYN. LLANYMDDYFRI

Rydderch gwyn ap *Dafydd* goch ap *Rydderch* ap *Rys* ap *Philyp* ap *Dafydd* vab ap *Rys* ap *Llywelyn* ap *Gruffudd* ap *Maredudd* gam ap *Gwallter* ap *Trahayarn* ap *Einion* ap *Elisse* ap (ap) *Ysgordan* vawr vchod.

Mam *Rydderch*: *Elizabeth* merch *Vorys* ap *Owen*. *Kais* mwy yn ach gefnder *Jhon* vychan o dv i vam.

Mam *Dafydd* a gair yn ach i frawd, *Howel* ap *Rydderch* vchod.

Gwraic *Rydderch* gwyn o[edd] *Sian* *verch* *Owen* *Bared* o *Sir* *Benfro*, o chwaer *Mr* *Jhon* *Philyp* o *Bictwn*, vnfam, vndad.

Plant *Rydderch* gwyn o *Sian*: *Dafydd*, *Rys*, *Jhon*, *Tomas*, *Lewys*, *Katrin*, a *Gwenllian*. 1554.

APPENDIX 4

List of authorities used by *Robert Vaughan* in addition to those used by *Peter Ellis*, in the hand of *Robert Vaughan*.

Harl. 2299 fo. 3v.

WC — *Wm* *Cynwal* 4o.

W.L.C.R.Ll. — *Card* *Rob*: *Llwyd* o *Drefwylan* o law *Wm* *Llŷn*. *Dd* ap *Gwilkws* prydydd.

Gh.AA — *Llyfr* achau ac *Arfau* *Gr.* *Hiraethog* 4o. [= *Pen.* 135]

Gh.M — *Y* *llyfr* mawr *Gh* 4o. [= *Pen.* 134]

Gh.T — *Llyfr* tene *Gh* 4o. [= *Pen.* 133]

MHL [Monogram] — *Llyfr* *Gh* sydd a llaw *Lewis* *Morganwg* ynddo 4o. [= *Pen.* 132]

Gh.bd — *Llyfr* byr dew *Gh* 8o.

- Gh.b — Llyfr byrr¹ Gh 8°. [= Pen. 176 pp. 1-116]
 Gh.bte² — Llyfr byrr tew Gh 8°. [= Pen. 177]
 NB [Monogram] — Llyfr o law Nicholas Esgob Bangor.
 M.ll — Mred Llwyd.
 I.Ll.J — Ieuan Llwyd Jeffrey Card Mr Prichard, CMP.
 J br — John Brook fol. [= Wrexham 1]
 H S^r M — Howel ap S^r Mathew.
 HMWC ne WCHM — Llaw Hugh Machno yn llyfr W^m Cymōd.
 CRW — Card Rys W^{ms} o Lanvair Duffrin Clwyd.
 LDs — Lyfr o law Lewis Dwn a Siams ei fâb. [Montgomeryshire]
 RCW — Card Rees Cain o Wilaston.
 JJ — Llyfr hên o eiddo Jon^a Jones o Gelli loffde. [= ? Pen. 138]
 SV * — [Simwnt Vychan folio]
 WC — Lly: W^m Cynwal i Jon^a Wyn Gr:
 GRC — Llyfr Gwyn Rs Cain.
 CDW — Card Dd W^{ms} o Vrynhafod yn Sir Gaerfyrthin.
 JB — Ieuan B[r]echva oi law i hûn. [= Pen. 131 pp. 199-308]

To these should be added:

- PE — Peter Ellis's books = BM. Add. 28033-4.
 MS — The MS. used by John Jones in Cardiff 25 pp. 32-100, quoted on p. 556 and in Pen. 283 pp. 44, 46.
 In Pen. 283 he refers to it as "Hen lyfr membrwn" (pp. 33, 44), "Ex libro antiquissimo MS" (p. 72), "Hen lyfr" (p. 54). Perhaps Hengwrt 141. See EWGT pp. 76, 79 n.1.
 llg — Llyfr Gwyn = Pen. 283. See Pen. 287 p. 589.
 RD — Robert Davies of Gwysaney. See Pen. 287 p. 665, from which we learn that pp. 394-7 of BM. Add. 28033 are in the hand of Robert Davies, probably the one who died in 1633. See DWB s.n. Davies-Cooke.

¹ ?*Read* bychan. "Llyfr casgl bychan o law Gh" in Pen. 287 p. 1229.

² The actual abbreviation used was Gh. lbt.

APPENDIX 5

JOHN POWYS

'Syr' John Powys, a cleric, appears to have written one or more manuscripts in about 1514 which were copied by Roger Morris of Coed-y-talwrn (fl. c. 1590). One of these was genealogical and the copy by Roger Morris, made in 1572, is contained in Mostyn MS. 113¹ pp. 87-161, as stated on p. 161. Many parts of this are very close to Pen. 127 part 1 (1510-1523), and it is clear that one must have been copied from the other or both were drawn from a common source. The other manuscript (or part of the same manuscript) by John Powys contained the tract *Enwau a Rhyfeddodau Ynys Prydain* and was copied by Roger Morris in Pen. 168 fos. 1^r-31^r in 1589.

John Powys gives his genealogy on page 161 of Mostyn 113 from which we learn that he was the son of Dafydd ap Ieuan ap Dafydd ap Morgan Llwyd of Mechain. His mother was Gwenllian ferch Dafydd (living 1438) ap Ieuan ap Dafydd Dymock of the family of Dymock of Llannerch Banna (Penley) in Maelor Saesneg. (See Pen. 287 p. 73, PF iii. 393). Gruffudd Hiraethog refers to Syr John Powys in Pen. 177 p. 43 as *Person Garth Beibio*, [Caereinion].

APPENDIX 6

THE REPORT ON MANUSCRIPTS IN THE WELSH LANGUAGE

Welsh Scholarship owes an incalculable debt to John Gwenogvryn Evans for his labours in producing the *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*, but I should like to repeat a warning that Evans himself made to his readers in the introduction (Vol. 2 part 4 p. vi):

The writer would like to warn those who build theories without consulting the originals, that fully two-thirds of the reports on documents in the Welsh language are the fruit of a rapid reading without further opportunity of consulting the manuscripts. The method of giving the quotations *verbatim et literatim* necessitates proximity and accessibility to the manuscripts in the final stages

¹ J. G. Evans originally thought that this manuscript was by Thomas Wiliems, but he later corrected this, see RWM i. xvi note, ii. 474 under Llanstephan 34. Cf. AWG 357, 372, 375.

of proof-reading. This was frequently impossible, and nearly always impracticable. Whatever mistakes crept into the 'copy' for the printer had, therefore, few chances of being rectified.

How wise this warning is can be gauged from the fact that only in a few cases does he quote literally and fully. More often what appear to be quotations are just an indication of contents. Though written in Welsh, sometimes in italics, this is no guarantee that the matter is not his own language or his own abbreviations, rather than that of the original. Some minor errors, even on this understanding, are to be expected in a work of such magnitude, but I have found a few cases where apparent quotations can be quite misleading. It should be emphasized that quotation from RWM is not a good substitute for examination of the original. If that is not possible and a quotation is made from RWM this should always be clearly stated. It is also worth mentioning that in the case of genealogical manuscripts whose contents are often of an extremely miscellaneous nature, there is sometimes material of interest to which no clue is given in the Report.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Arch. Camb. — *Archaeologia Cambrensis*
 AWG — 'An approach to Welsh Genealogy' by Major Francis Jones, *Trans. Cym.*, 1948 pp. 403-466.
 BBCS — *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, University of Wales.
 BM — British Museum
 Card. — Cardiff MS. (Cardiff Public Libraries)
 DWB — *The Dictionary of Welsh Biography*, The Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, London, 1959.
 Dwnn — *Heraldic Visitations of Wales* by Lewys Dwnn, edited by S. R. Meyrick, 2 vols., Llandovery, 1846.
 EWGT — *Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts*, edited with notes and indexes by P. C. Bartrum, Cardiff, 1966.
 Harl. — Harleian MS, British Museum.
 PAR — 'Plant yr Arglwydd Rhys' by P. C. Bartrum, *National Library of Wales Journal*, XIV, pp. 97-104.
 Pen. — Peniarth MS. at National Library of Wales.
 PF — *The History of the Princes . . . of Powys Fadog* by J. Y. W. Lloyd, 6 vols., London, 1881-7.
 PP₁ — 'Pedigrees of the Welsh Tribal Patriarchs' by P. C. Bartrum, *National Library of Wales Journal*, XIII, pp. 93-146.
 PP₂ — 'Pedigrees of the Welsh Tribal Patriarchs, Continued' by P. C. Bartrum, *National Library of Wales Journal*, XV, pp. 157-166..
 RWM — *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*, by John Gwenogvryn Evans, Historical MSS. Commission, London, 1898-1910. Pagination as for two volumes.
 Trans. Cym. — *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*.